

REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration at least because the rejection of claims 41 and 42 appears to mistakenly refer to elements in claim 40 and does not address the claimed “broadcasting wave input circuit.” For example, the rejection of claim 41 states the phrase “a millimeter wave receiving circuit receiving millimeter waves, obtained by up-converting a plurality of broadcasting waves ...”, which is language directly obtained from claim 40.

Claim Rejection: Claims 41 and 42

Claims 41 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,200,826 (Seong) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,321,736 (Beasley). Applicants submit that the rejection appears to be in error and should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection refers to the claimed “millimeter wave receiving circuit” and “broadcasting wave demodulation circuit”, which are elements of claim 40, instead of the “broadcasting wave input circuit receiving a plurality of broadcasting waves ...” as recited in claim 41. Applicants submit that Seong fails to teach or suggest the claimed “broadcasting wave input circuit” at least because Seongs’ tuning system is fed a TV signal in which a channel TV signal is selected (col. 4, lines 19-22) rather than receiving a plurality of broadcasting waves. The Office Action alleges that the claimed “frequency arranging circuit” is met by the second converter 40 (col. 3, lines 10-24). However, Seongs’ antenna and up-conversion portion, for example, do not receive a plurality of broadcasting waves by which a corresponding plurality of broadcasting signals are adjusted in the second converter 40 (i.e., a frequency arranging circuit).

Thus, Applicants submit that Seong fails to teach or suggest at least the claimed “broadcasting wave input circuit” and “frequency arranging circuit”.

The Office Action relies on Beasley for teaching the claimed “connection unit” and “power receptor circuit”. However, Beasley also fails to teach or suggest the claimed “broadcasting wave input circuit” and “frequency arranging circuit”, and thus does not make up for the deficiency in Seong. Therefore, Applicants submit that Seong and Beasley, either alone or in combination, fail to teach each and every claimed element and the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejection: Claims 40 and 51

Claims 40 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Seong.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 40 is directed to an electronic apparatus which receives television broadcasting and includes, among other things, a millimeter wave receiving circuit receiving millimeter waves obtained by up-converting a plurality of broadcasting waves. The rejection states that the claimed “millimeter wave receiving circuit” and “broadcasting wave demodulation circuit down-converting said millimeter waves” are met by the first converter 20 of Seong. Applicants disagree.

Seongs’ first converter 20 is an up-conversion portion for tracking a desired channel frequency from a TV RF signal (50 to 900 MHz) and up converts the RF signal to 2 GHz. As noted above for claim 41, Seong’s tuner does not receive waves based on a plurality of

broadcasting waves by which a corresponding plurality of broadcasting signals are adjusted in an inverse frequency arranging circuit.

Thus, unlike Seong, the claimed invention includes a millimeter wave receiving circuit receiving millimeter waves based on a plurality of broadcasting waves, and a broadcast wave demodulation circuit that down-converts the millimeter waves to the frequency of the broadcasting waves.

The Office Action states that the claimed “inverse frequency arranger” is met by the second converter 40 of Seong. Applicants disagree.

The claim specifically recites, “an inverse frequency arranger receiving output signals of said broadcasting wave demodulation circuit.” Since the only component of Seong’s TV tuner that down-converts a millimeter wave is the mixer 43/oscillator 42, to meet the claim an inverse frequency arranger would be located at the output of Seong’s mixer 43. However, it can be seen that Seong does not actually teach an inverse frequency arranger that receives down-converted output signals of the broadcasting wave demodulation circuit.

Thus, Applicants submit that Seong fails to teach each and every element of claim 40, as well as associated dependent claim 51. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejection: Claims 38 and 39

Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,953,045 (Tanishima). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 38 recites an electronic apparatus capable of utilizing an output signal from a millimeter wave receiver, comprising:

a connector connected with said millimeter wave receiver; and

a control signal transmission circuit transmitting a control signal indicating information provided in said electronic apparatus to said connector.

In other words, claim 38 is directed to an electronic apparatus having a connector receiving an output from a millimeter wave receiver and receiving a control signal indicating information provided in said electronic apparatus, i.e., serving as a two-way communication path.

Claim 39 is comparable to claim 38, but additionally recites a memory circuit.

In the section, “Response to Arguments” the Office Action expresses that Tanishima teaches a video channel selection type radio reception apparatus connected to a television receiver “(which includes a tuner to receive the channel selection and tune to select channels)” by a cable 71. The Office Action further expresses that Tanishima’s “Figure 9 clearly shows where channel selections are received via the tuner of the television receiver and transmitted via cable 71 to the V-CH-SEL.” In other words, the Office Action appears to indicate that the television transmits a channel selection to the video channel selection type radio reception apparatus via cable 71. Applicants disagree.

The cable 71 is only disclosed as transmitting a video signal to the television receiver for a selected channel. In particular, the demodulator 51g’ demodulates the video signal and inputs the video signal to the television receiver 61 (paragraph bridging columns 9 and 10). The television does not output the channel selection signal. Thus, if the video channel selection type

radio reception apparatus of Fig. 9 could be said to read on the claimed electronic apparatus, the cable connection for cable 71 is not disclosed as being a two-way connector.

Thus, Applicants submit that unlike Tanishima, the claimed "connector" is connected to a millimeter wave receiver, receiving an output signal from the millimeter wave receiver, and receives a control signal from a control signal transmission circuit. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

Terrell C. Birch

Registration No.: 19,382

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant